

## **Minutes: Process Standardization Working Group Meeting**

Wednesday, March 7, 2001, 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

SRP – ISB Building  
Flagstaff Conference Room

	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Anticipated Outcome</b>	<b>Att.</b>
1	Welcome, Introductions, Sign-In, and Approval of Minutes	Evelyn Dryer	<p>Ms. Dryer welcomed participants to the full group session of the Process Standardization Working Group meeting. A sign-in sheet was circulated. Participants introduced themselves. Minutes from the February 21, 2001 meeting were approved with the following changes</p> <p><b><u>Minute Revisions</u></b></p> <p><i>9. The following issues were agreed upon by the group as “quick hitters” and will be added to future agendas to discuss for 1 hour: (Master Issues List attached)</i></p> <p><b><u>Issue 84</u></b></p> <p><i>The group agreed that this issue is resolved since Staff confirmed at a prior meeting that the bill is considered a Final Bill when the customer switches providers. The group remembers Staff’s confirmation of New West Energy’s definition of “Customer”, that one service point closure would not be a Final Bill if the customer has other active service points with the ESP.</i></p>	1
2	Report from Janie Mollon on revised Change Control Process	Janie Mollon	Evelyn will send out a copy of Janie’s proposal prior to the March 21, 2001 meeting. This item will be deferred to the March 21 <sup>st</sup> agenda.	
3	Report from Staff on the definition of Final Bill Issue 84	ACC Staff	Barbara Keene (ACC Staff) communicated that Ray did not recall the discussion on this issue. Staff requested additional time to review the issue and come prepared to the March 21, 2001 meeting with a definition of “Final Bill” and “Customer”.	

Issue 100 :  
What process can be developed to facilitate a customer installing an IDR meter and equipment before DA that allows a customer to move to DA and back with the same equipment.

1 hour discussion

Evelyn  
Dryer

SRP and Citizen distributed their positions .

TEP and the Cooperative were not ready to discuss their positions. They will attempt to be ready at the March 21st meeting. The documents will be sent to Mary at the ACC, for distribution to the PSWG participant list by March 19.

#### **SRP Position**

SRP provided a handout (attached) and reported that SRP will install an IDR meter at a customer's request while they are Standard offer. Fees relative to this request were unknown and will be clarified at the March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. SRP will not transfer equipment ownership or sell meter equipment. If SRP remains the MSP for customers opting for Direct Access service, the SRP IDR meter may stay in place while the customer is a DA customer and can be used for Standard Offer services if the customer returns. If the customer opting for DA services selects a third party MSP other than SRP, the SRP IDR meter must be removed and replaced with a customer, ESP or MSP owned IDR meter.

**Action Item:** SRP to confirm fees associated with the installation of an IDR meter for a Standard Offer customer.

#### **CUC**

Leann Torkelson (R.W. Beck/Citizens) provided a handout (attached) and reported that CUC will be willing to purchase DA IDR meters when a customer is returning to Standard Offer. The only requirement is the meter must meet their meter standards. Currently, CUC has a load requirement for Commercial Standard Offer customers where an IDR meter is required. Residential Standard Offer customers are not eligible for IDR metering.

**Action Item:** LeeAnn will report the actual load requirement for Standard Offer customers at the March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. Also, LeeAnn will report if CUC would be willing to sell the CUC Standard Offer IDR meters to the customer when the customer has opted for Direct Access service.

Jim Wontor (APSES) clarified that the issue is - can a Standard Offer customer get IDR metering equipment to prepare for DA. Also the ability to keep that equipment when they switch between Standard Offer and DA without the cost of buying the equipment again and reducing the meter installation costs. He also offered to review how the process is working in California.

**Action Item:** Jim will research how the process works in CA and report back to the March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting

#### **TEP**

Evelyn reported that TEP would install IDR equipment at the customer's request for an incremental charge.

**Action Item: Proposal/suggestions from TEP and Cooperatives for handling this issue will be circulated through Mary at the ACC by March 19, 2001 and will be discussed at the March 21, 2001 meeting.**

5

Report from Ken Grove and Janet Henry regarding action item for Issue 109 - New CC&N application needs to be reviewed to verify that there are no inconsistencies between what the PSWG has approved.

Ken  
Grove &  
Janet  
Henry

Jim Wontor (APSES), reported that the ACC CC&N document touches on three documents:

- 1) CC&N requirements for MRSP
- 2) VEE
- 3) MRSP Performance

The suggestion is to take out all references to VEE standards from the CC&N document since they are covered in the approved state standard VEE document. The remaining CC&N requirements can remain and serve as the cover letter to the VEE standards. Once the Performance monitoring criteria has been completed, it can be added to the VEE document as well. The end result would be, one comprehensive document that provides an MRSP with the information needed to operate in the state of AZ.

**Action Item:** The MRSP Performance Monitoring Task Team will review the CC&N requirements for MRSP and make sure the 9 points covered under "Continuing Certification" are covered in the Performance Monitoring criteria. Currently, #1, 4 & 9 are in the MRSP Performance Monitoring status report.

Janet will report her findings on the MSP CC&N requirements at the March 21, 2001 meeting.

6

Q&A for Task Team Chair addressing Issue 101: MRSP Performance Monitoring and Testing

Janie  
Mollon

The group reviewed the MRSP Performance Monitoring and Testing status report. The following comments were made:

Jack White (SRP) recommended the warning letter sent to the Utilities Director be standardized.

The group discussed the confidentiality concern of copying ESPs on the MRSP warning letters sent to the Utilities Director. The warning letter is based on the MRSPs performance for customers served by multiple ESPs. The ESP will be receiving Event notification per incident as well as a monthly Performance Monitoring Report (PMR).

Jack White asked what the ACC process will be once a Warning letter is sent and should it be tied into the MRSP Performance Monitoring document. Barbara Keene advised that this is a new process and there is no process in place to show what happens after the letter is sent.

Jack also mentioned that there is no language to advise of the consequences for poor performance. The group added language to state that repeated offense may lead to de-certification and to refer to the UDC procedures.

The following items will be taken back to the Task Team for incorporation into the document and or research:

- Investigate options that would provide notification to the ESP that a Warning letter has been sent to their contracted MRSP for the accounts served by that specific ESP.
- Draft a standard format for the Warning letter
- Draft a standard format for the letter sent to the Utilities Director
- Incorporate the 6 six items from the CC&N MRSP requirements
- Incorporate de-certification language for UDC
- Incorporate de-certification language for ACC
- Is there a “start up” period before performance monitoring begins?

The group agreed that additional Task Team meetings are needed to complete the document.

**Action Item:** Evelyn will communicate to Janie for coordination of future meetings.

7 Q&A for Task Team  
Chair addressing Issue  
61: MSP Performance  
Monitoring and Testing

John  
Wallace

John reported that the Task Team would need additional time to complete the Task. The Task Team estimates that they will need approximately 4 to 5 meetings. The group gave feedback that they would prefer full day meetings as opposed to the half-day meetings.

The task team will evaluate the items recommended for review/incorporation to the MRSP Task Team document. They will also review the CC&N requirements and see what should be included in the MSP Performance Monitoring document.

- |   |  |              |  |
|---|--|--------------|--|
| 8 | Q&A for Task Team Chair addressing Issue 107: Develop a document showing all agreed upon Metering business rules | Stacy Aguayo | Jenine Schenk (APS) reviewed the revised proposed Metering Handbook outline.<br><br>The group agreed that the scope of this task has increased substantially. At this time, the Task Team will focus on filling in the sections that pertain only to issues the PSWG has approved and address the other sections later. With this specific focus, the Task Team is aiming to finalize their work by the April 4 <sup>th</sup> meeting. |
| 9 | Day of Install and Day of Removal Issue 41 and 103<br><br>1 hour discussion                                      | Evelyn Dryer | Due to time constraints, the group agreed to defer this issue to the March 21, 2001.   |

The group discussed the various positions of the participants.

### **CUC**

Ken Bagley (R.W. Beck/Citizens) reported that CUC wants Transmission listed in both Competitive and Non Competitive to allow for definition of future rules and flexibility. – CUC believes they may be billing both the end use customer and/or a Scheduling Coordinator for transmission. They want to make sure that the UDC is not required to give up “rights” to something that they can’t be assured that they can re-acquire when the customer returns to Standard Offer service.

The group discussed the original intent of listing Transmission as a Competitive charge was to allow the customer to be able to look at the unbundled portion of their bill and see what parts other entities may provide. Since Transmission is billed by the UDC to the Scheduling Coordinator, it will not appear on the Distribution portion from the UDC. The group reviewed the actual definition section and confirmed that although the rules are somewhat ambiguous, it confirms who is able to provide Transmission. CUC agreed to leave as is, as long as the definition of Transmission remains Non-Competitive.

**TEP** – Not in favor of moving Transmission from Competitive to Non Competitive.

**APS** – Not in favor of moving Transmission from Competitive to Non Competitive.

Evelyn Dryer (TEP) Suggested changing the title from Competitive and Non Competitive to something else.

The group agreed not to change the definitions but is looking at future options of recommending changes or removal of the titles showing Competitive and Non Competitive.

**Action Item:** Participants will take the issue of removing the titles “Competitive” and “Non Competitive Services” from R14-2-1606 C2 back to their companies. The titles to remove would be a. and b. and would be a change to the rules in the future.

10	Review Open issues and re-prioritize	Evelyn Dryer	Due to time constraints, the group was not able to review Open issues and re-prioritize.	
			<b>Action Item:</b> Evelyn will send out the list of issues that were identified in a previous meeting. Participants are to review the list and prioritize for discussion at the March 21 <sup>st</sup> meeting.	
11	New Issues	Evelyn Dryer	Jack White advised that there have been amendments to their Code of Conduct. As a result, SRP will be offering ESP Consolidated billing and not accommodating Dual Billing or UDC Consolidated Billing. Through system testing of the AZ 810, they found an issue with the AZ 810. The AZ 810 requires a read and is a mandatory field. SRP does not have a requirement to show meter reads on their bills and requests that the PSWG change the field in the 810 to Conditional from Mandatory which will allow SRP not to include the read in their outbound 810 transactions. The group agreed to amend the field in the AZ 810 to be a Conditional field thus, accommodating SRP' processes under the House Bill as well as the ACC Rules for all other Utilities.	4
			The issue was added as issue #111 to the Master Issues list	
			<b>Action Item:</b> Gene Schlecta (SRP) will amend the 810 and send it out to the group. This issue will be raised at the next meeting for approval.	
			No other issues were raised.	
12	Meeting Evaluation	Evelyn Dryer	The group provided feedback.	
13	Set Next Agenda	Evelyn Dryer	The group set the next agenda.	
14	Adjourn Meeting	Evelyn Dryer	The meeting was adjourned.	

## PARTICIPANT LIST

PARTICIPANTS AT MARCH 7, 2001  
PROCESS STANDARDIZATION WORKING GROUP

Name	Organization
Aguayo, Stacy	APS
Bagley, Ken	R.W. Beck / Citizens
Brown, Debbie	SRP
Dryer, Evelyn	TEP
Greenrock, June	SRP
Henry, Janet	Axon Field Solutions
Keene, Barbara	Commission Staff
McArthur, Stephen	Mohave Electric
Nuszloch, Larry	SRP
Pichoff, Darrel	KR Saline & Associates
Renfro, Shirley	Pinnacle West
Schenk, Jenine	APS
Slechta, Gene	SRP
Taylor, Judy	TEP
Torkelson, LeeAnn	R.W. Beck / Citizens
Wallace, John	GCSECA
White, Jack	SRP
Wontor, Jim	APSES
Zimmerman, Mike	New West Energy